

Context Sensitive Committee Meeting Summary

The SR-12 Project Team and the members of the Context Sensitive Committee held a meeting on April 21, 2005 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Boulder, Utah. The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Committee Member Attendees:

Allysia Angus, US Bureau of Land Management
Sharol Bernardo, Garfield County Travel Council
Jim Catlin, Wild Utah Project
Vard Coombs, Garfield County School District
Joe Gregory, Federal Highway Administration
Laurel Hagen, (sitting in for Liz Thomas) Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
Keith Gailey, Boulder Town Mayor (sitting in for Jeanne Harshman, Boulder Town Council)
John Mavor, Bicycle Community
Sue Mosier, Escalante/Boulder Chamber of Commerce
Rick Torgerson, Utah Department of Transportation

Committee Members Not Present:

Dell LaFevre/Clare Ramsay, Garfield County Commission and Ranching Community
Marlene Stowe, Escalante City Council

Facilitators:

Kim Clark, H.W. Lochner
Michelle Fishburne, H.W. Lochner

Project Team Members:

Andrea Clayton, H.W. Lochner
HG Kunzler, H.W. Lochner
Randi Shover, H.W. Lochner
Mike Brehm, Brehm Environmental
Steve Trimble, Words and Photographs

Additional Attendees:

Robert Dowell, Utah Department of Transportation
Daryl Friant, Utah Department of Transportation
Julian Hatch, Boulder Regional Group
Scott Brody, Boulder Town Resident (sitting in for part of the meeting on behalf of the Mayor)

The following is a summary of the meeting (all italicized items were included on the original agenda) (all items mentioned that need to be addressed at future dates and meetings were clustered in a "parking lot" to be revisited at a later date. Those items are listed at the end of this summary):

1. Welcome

- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne of H.W. Lochner (Lochner) welcomed the attendees. They gave an overview of the new materials for the committee members' notebooks. The new materials included information from the open houses that were held the previous night, a new comment form, and the agenda for the day's meeting.
- Review Agenda and Logistics
 - Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne proceeded to review the day's agenda. They informed the committee members that they would continue on with the exercise from the previous

meeting since many of the members didn't have a chance to complete the *Project Area Conditions and Concerns Exercise*.

2. *Updates Since Last Meeting*

- *Committee Comments on Meeting Minutes*
 - Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked each of the committee members if they had any comments on the meeting minutes that they had received. The only comment came from Michelle Fishburne on clarifying the term mule trails vs. mule trains that was brought up at the first meeting. It was clarified that mule trails was the intended meaning.
- *Committee Member News*
 - John Mavor contacted cycling businesses. The individuals that he spoke with are advocates for cycling businesses and groups being able to tour on SR-12. He said they want to make sure the corridor remains open for cyclists. He also stated that the individuals that he spoke with were very passionate about the whole of SR-12 from Panguitch to Torrey.
 - Allysia Angus brought up the issue of open range and fencing. She stated that the permittee, BLM, and UDOT are all responsible parties when it comes to open range on or near SR-12. If a motorist hits a cow on the roadway, the liability comes back to the permittee. She also spoke about the grazing study that is currently being conducted by BLM. It is in alternative development now. The grazing study is not addressing open range issues.
 - Sharol Bernardo stated she heard from a couple of individuals who reported that along the road near Calf Creek where the Jersey Barrier has been placed, the road is very narrow especially when a large vehicle is coming in the opposite direction. Sharol also noted that the barriers and some natural material have been sloughing off onto the roadway.
 - Jeanne Harshman is moving to Texas and will not be able to sit on this committee. Mayor Keith Gailey has replaced her for the time being.
- *Update on Project Activities*
 - **Parking Lot Issues:**
 - **Utilities:** To be determined
 - **Management of cattle, open range:** Currently the subject of a document for BLM
 - **Transportation Projects:** Information and a copy of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program is available at www.udot.utah.gov/index.php/m=c/tid=40
 - **2 lanes vs. 4 lanes in Escalante City limits:** UDOT and Escalante to determine separately from this project (not directly relevant due to the logical termini)
 - **Tourism:** To be determined
 - **Evaluation of accidents: social vs. physical road conditions:** Addressed as part of the roadway discussion later in the meeting
 - **Crosswalks near Escalante High School:** To be determined
 - **Proposed Wilderness Boundaries**
 - Jim Catlin has provided GIS data on the wilderness areas proposed by the Utah Wilderness Coalition. Andrea Clayton will coordinate with Mr. Catlin on this matter.
 - **Archaeological Report**

- Montgomery has completed a review of existing documentation of approximately 250 archaeological sites near the corridor.
- Public Open Houses
 - Public open houses were held in Escalante and Boulder on April 20th. The objectives for the open houses were as follows:
 - Refine Understanding of Context
 - Identify Needs
 - Develop Evaluation Criteria
 - Brainstorm Possible Solutions
 - The public was given the opportunity to write their comments down on maps. The maps and comments from the open houses were presented to the CSC members.
- Roadway Design Standards
 - The project team is in the process of collecting standards from various agencies. Roadway design standards for SR-12 have not yet been defined. The team will also collect standards from the National Park Service.
- Overview of project schedule
 - The project team would like to have a draft purpose and need statement available by the next committee meeting in June.
 - The project team will meet with the public and the committee again in August at the end of Phase I. The project will then lead into Phase II.
- Allisia Angus informed the committee and project team about the Scenic Byway 12 Celebration that will take place in Cannonville on August 27th from 3:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
- Maintenance Activities
 - Robert Dowell, the Region 4 Richfield District Director for the Utah Department of Transportation, spoke to the committee regarding road maintenance issues and activities. He discussed the following:
 - Due to recent heavy rainfall and material sloughing into the roadway prism, maintenance activities have been necessary on SR-12 while the current environmental process continues.
 - One of UDOT's obligations is to maintain what they have. The following maintenance activities will continue to take place: maintaining drainages ensuring that inlets and outlets are open, crack sealing for pavement, cleaning cut ditches, and performing erosion control.
 - The recent work in the Calf Creek area was due to debris and material sliding. The fill should not have been placed in the area that it was. The fill material may have to be removed though Mr. Dowell is concerned that removing it may cause more damage than leaving it where it is. Fill will no longer be placed beyond the existing slopes without first obtaining environmental clearance. The challenge will be to continue to maintain the area and find areas to place the fill. UDOT does not want to waste the material and they will haul it when necessary to make sure it gets utilized.
 - Vard Coombs asked Mr. Dowell what the problem is with where the fill has been placed. Mr. Dowell responded by saying that there is sensitive vegetation in the area and that it is inappropriate to place fill in riparian areas without getting prior

authorization. Mr. Dowell responded by saying the Calf Creek area is very sensitive and the sediment could run into the stream.

- Jim Catlin asked whether UDOT has a document on what the protocol is for this sort of issue. Mr. Dowell stated he is not aware of a specific document but they do have guidelines they need to follow. He also stated that anytime maintenance reaches beyond the shoulders of the roadway the appropriate environmental measures (such as BMPs) need to be taken. Jim Catlin asked how UDOT handles beaver dams and herbicides. Rick Torgerson responded by stating UDOT doesn't typically encroach channels or streams during maintenance activities; they don't have jurisdiction over waters of the U.S. Robert Dowell added that there are standard practices on application of herbicides. Daryl Friant stated that the Division of Wildlife Resources can blast the dams if they are causing damage to a roadway. They (UDWR) would need to obtain a stream alteration permit and need to work with ACOE. Usually the federal agency does the removal.
- Robert Dowell requested the committee provide input on what cross sections would be desirable, relative to both use and maintenance. Even the narrow, sensitive cross section from the Escalante River to Calf Creek needs to be maintained. The committee could also identify areas for future pullouts so maintenance crews could deposit material in those areas. The work for widening could be started in those areas without utilizing project funds. He also stated he would like guidance on what maintenance crews can do.
- Sharol Bernardo asked Mr. Dowell if UDOT maintenance differentiates natural vs. non-natural material. Mr. Dowell responded by stating they would try to reuse natural material where practical and allowable, but non-natural materials (concrete, pavement) would not typically be placed in riparian areas. He also noted there are two different situations. 1. Erosion problems: put material in whatever they can use. It is done in conjunction with UDWR and stream alteration permits. 2. Emergency situations: they may get the permit after the fact.
- Jim Catlin asked if there is a difference in whether the stream body is a functioning fishery. Robert Dowell stated that UDOT instructs maintenance crews to stay out of all streams. Daryl Friant stated that the reasons include water quality and stream alteration. One of the interested agencies includes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- Laurel Hagen stated that there are better ways to shore up the shoulder as opposed to loosely placing soil and rock in a riparian area that could allow sediment into the stream. She commented that a couple of possibilities would be to either remove the slope or re-vegetate and compact the slope to prevent sediment from going into the stream.
- Robert Dowell informed the committee that he has informed the maintenance crews how to properly handle this issue.

3. Group Exercise (same groups from last meeting)

- Kim Clark then moved into the exercise from the previous meeting. She stated that not all groups had a chance to finish the activity. She also asked each group to look more

closely and specifically at distinct areas. She asked each member to identify areas that are sacred to them and the community, and to label them on the project maps. Because Group 2 finished the exercise at the first meeting, they were asked to assess the comments from the public open house maps and identify the needs from the public.

- Maps were then laid out on each table and the committee members got back into their groups from the previous meeting. However, Marlene Stowe and Dell LaFevre/Clare Ramsay from Group 1 were not at the meeting. To make the groups more even, Sharol Bernardo moved from Group 3 to Group 1. The groups were as follows:
 - Group 1: Rick Torgerson, Jim Catlin, Sharol Bernardo
 - Group 2: John Mavor, Keith Gailey, Sue Mosier, Allysia Angus
 - Group 3: Laurel Hagen, Vard Coombs, Joe Gregory
- Comments were recorded on project mapping.

4. *Project Purpose and Need Discussion*

- Following the group exercise, Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne discussed and defined purpose and need.
 - The purpose is defined as the *objective* of the project.
 - The needs are defined as *problems* that exist (based on factual data).

The project needs that Group 2 identified at the previous meeting were discussed. They are as follows:

- Inadequate number and design of pullouts for hikes/recreation parking (vehicles are parked on the road).
- Safe passage opportunities for cyclists are inadequate.
- Calf Creek Bridge banks are eroding.
- Structural supports and barriers are inadequate, unsightly and occupying critical roadway prism.
- Traffic is moving too fast in certain locations.
- Hazards represented by cattle and wildlife entering the roadway are unacceptable.
- Right-of-way conditions impede UDOT's ability to maintain the roadway.

5. *Group Exercise – Part 2: Identify Project Needs Exercise*

- Each group was then asked to present what needs (sometimes articulated in the form of associated objectives and possible solutions) they have identified. Group 2 identified needs, based on its interpretation of the public open house comments. The needs from each group are as follows:
 - Group 1:
 - Make sure there is enough height clearance for large vehicles under the dark red cliff near Calf Creek. The perception is that it is not high enough and large vehicles are darting into the other lane.
 - Mitigate extreme speed changes. Make speed transition zones for areas between a high to low speed change.
 - Use an aesthetic approach to structures, walls, barriers, etc. Lower the height of the barriers.
 - Need for parking restrictions.
 - Maintain visual appeal for highway and non-highway users.
 - Create uphill bicycle pullouts/lanes (where conducive).

- Create passing pullouts/lanes.
- Put the utilities underground.
- Create better/more interpretive sites.
- Group 2 (based on public comments from open houses):
 - Protect archaeological and paleontological sites (i.e. dinosaur tracks).
 - Reduce speed.
 - Evaluate safe ingress and egress (specifically at businesses and trailheads).
 - Provide maintenance notification.
 - Widen in some areas for safety.
 - Improve aesthetics of (safety) barriers.
 - Bicycle safety.
 - Safety signing (ice, deer, cows, etc.).
- Group 3:
 - Turnouts near scenic or slow areas. (Maybe a foot path along Hogsback.)
 - Hogsback safety.
 - Opportunities for passing.
 - Make improvements with minimal impact.
 - Force people to slow down (signs, bumps, etc.).
 - Rebuild Calf Creek Bridge.
 - Bike safety.
 - Use universal signage (i.e. graphic depicting a car with rocks falling on it) for non-English speaking tourists and visitors.
 - Do not make it look over engineered.
- Following the break for lunch, Ms. Fishburne and Ms. Clark summarized the comments from the committee members regarding needs. They are as follows:
 - Pullouts/recreation parking (move parked vehicles off road)
 - Bicycle safety
 - Fix Calf Creek Bridge
 - Fix where pipes/barriers are supporting road
 - Parking restrictions/locations
 - Maintenance opportunities/notifications
 - Protect archaeological and paleontological sites
 - Address cattle/wildlife crashes
 - Right-of-way
 - Slow traffic down (some areas)
 - Passing opportunities (pullouts)
 - Minimal impacts
 - Safety – ingress/egress Hogsback, signage, height clearance/widening
 - Aesthetic solutions/approach – on- and off-road views, underground utilities
 - Waysides/interpretive sites (incorporate information into pullouts)

6. *Evaluation Criteria Discussion*

- What is it? It is a way to measure performance.
- Why is it important? It defines the indicators used to determine if something is working as intended and to compare options.
 - Evaluation Criteria:

- The framework for evaluation criteria is identified by: corridor needs, vision, and context
- Evaluation criteria also takes into account: safety standards, regulatory requirements, impacts to natural and human environments, consistency with project vision and area context
- Evaluation criteria framework: at this stage in the project, the evaluation criteria will:
 - Measure effectiveness of the solutions in meeting needs
 - Assist in defining the data needs
 - Focus the project study efforts
- The framework of evaluation criteria will not change as we progress through the project. However, the evaluation criteria will:
 - Evolve
 - Become more detailed
 - Ultimately include specific impacts to compare alternatives
- When screening evaluation criteria the committee members were asked to think about what the project objectives are and what the needs are. Ms. Clark passed out color coded tables with evaluation criteria listed. To understand the process of evaluating alternatives, she asked the committee to take into consideration the following questions:
 - Does the preferred alternative need to take into consideration all? some? of the project needs listed? Are there some needs that are more important than others?

Break for lunch

7. *Committee Exercise: SR-12 Evaluation Criteria Exercise*

- A question for Group 1 was raised regarding one of the needs they listed. They listed “interpretive sites” as one of their needs and Michelle Fishburne asked them to clarify the meaning. Rick Torgerson responded by saying their team would like to see more interpretive sites incorporated into the pull offs/turnouts to tell the story of the area.
- Allysia Angus then inquired about what the official term is for the little bubbles/spots off to the side of the road that slow vehicles can move over and let faster moving traffic pass by. Rick Torgerson said they are called “pullouts”.
- When screening evaluation criteria, a person must focus on the outcomes that they believe are the most important and decide what they want to use as minimum performance standards.
- Ms. Fishburne discussed the project vision as defined by the CSC members and how those became project objectives. Boards with the CSC members’ project visions listed were shown to illustrate how the visions aided in defining and developing some of the project objectives. John Mavor noted that several of the objectives could be considered as needs. Michelle commented that there is some overlap, and that for now, the project team wants to make sure the intent of the visions were captured. Jim Catlin added that distinguishing between objectives and needs can be difficult. The objectives discussed are as follows:
 - **Objective 1:** Preserve the history and contribute to the culture of the community
 - **Vision:** A project communities are proud of, the best for the community, maintain SR-12 as the life blood of the community, contribute to a future for the young, honor the history and culture of the communities

- **Objective 2:** Meet the transportation demands, improve safety
 - **Vision:** Meet the traffic demands, grow to fit the increasing traffic, some improvements, make a little safer, travel safely across, a safe and more beautiful road
- **Objective 3:** Preserve the natural environment
 - **Vision:** Do only what is absolutely necessary, limit changes
- **Objective 4:** Maintain the character of the road
 - **Vision:** Maintain character of the road, enhance experiences
- **Objective 5:** Maintain the visual appeal
 - **Vision:** Maintain visual appeal
- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked the committee members for their comments on what the objectives and visions should be. The comments were as follows:
 - **Change Objective 1:** Contribute to the *economics* and culture of the community.
 - **Change Objective 2:** Meet the *varied* transportation needs.
 - Jim Catlin brought up the objective of “prevent the establishment of new, conflicting back-country uses (such as bike paths in the WSA).” Some of the committee members asked for clarification on the term “back-country” and Mr. Catlin redefined this to “off-highway.” The other committee members stated that the statement was too vague and confusing. Ms. Fishburne suggested looking at it from a project need standpoint instead of as a project objective.
 - Jim Catlin raised a concern with the vision in Objective 3. He stated that the word “necessary” is too broad. Ms. Fishburne stated that the comment came from Laurel Hagen at the first meeting and asked her if she wouldn’t mind clarifying what she meant. Ms. Hagen stated that she meant only make minimal changes. After much discussion, including considering and then eliminating the use of the phrase “in deference to”, a few group members suggested “meet the needs of” might best address this concern with Objective 3.
 - **Change Objective 3:** *Meet the needs of the natural environment.*
 - **Change Vision:** *Prevent conflicting uses in the area (i.e. WSA’s).*
 - **Change Objective 5:** Maintain and *enhance* the visual appeal.
- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne then reviewed the project objectives and comments as defined by the general public. They are as follows:
 - **Objective 1:** Improve ability to perform adequate maintenance operations.
 - **Comments:** Better maintenance, road needs to be resurfaced, concern regarding road conditions, maintenance should be good quality and subtle, identify long-term solutions for maintenance, eliminate need for frequent small maintenance projects.
 - **Objective 2:** Balance the needs of the different modes of transportation.
 - **Comments:** Tourist traffic is difficult, slow moving trucks and RVs, summer traffic is really heavy for the size of the road, and there is a safety problem when it comes to bicycles. The bike safety issue includes both factual and perceived elements.
 - **Objective 3:** Incorporate safety improvements that are consistent with the context of the roadway.
 - **Comments:** Turnouts are needed, no more ugly barriers, improvements need to be sensitive in order to preserve landscape quality, provide an alternative route for traffic to avoid Calf Creek and reduce traffic in Boulder. Consider input from law enforcement representatives familiar with user behavior on the corridor.
 - **Objective 4:** Preserve water resources.

- **Comments:** Preserve Calf Creek.
- **Objective 5:** Incorporate science, research, and facts into the decision making process.
 - **Comments:** Use science, research, and facts when making decisions.
- **Objective 6:** Improve safety on SR-12.
 - **Comments:** Address safety along SR-12, other areas along SR-12 need improvements, dangerous curves located near Boulder, danger from cattle on the road.
- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked the committee members for their comments on what the objectives from the public should be. The comments were as follows:
 - **Change Objective 1:** Improve ability to perform adequate maintenance operations *appropriate to the place*.
 - **Change Objective 3:** Incorporate safety improvements that are consistent with the context of the roadway *and environment*.
 - Jim Catlin inquired whether safety improvements include more law enforcement. The project team responded by stating that creative solutions that are outside highway design solutions can certainly be considered.
 - **Change Objective 5:** Incorporate science, research, and facts into the *open* decision-making process.
 - John Mavor brought up the issue of bicycle safety and the difference between actual and perceived safety. He postulated concern for bicyclists could come from motorists who have to make a split decision or quick maneuver when they come up on a bicycle on SR-12. That “perception” needs to be addressed.

8. *Typical Roadway Standards*

- HG Kunzler gave an overview of typical roadway standards and some of the data that the project team has gathered. The information is as follows:
 - Traffic counts:
 - Current AADT (Average Annual Daily Traffic) (2002) = 1240
 - 2012 AADT = 1767
 - 2022 AADT = 2477
 - 2030 AADT = 3500
 - Crash data breakdown:
 - Drunk driving related accidents = 1
 - Vehicle problem related accidents = 4
 - Driver error related accidents = 17: speed too fast 19: improper lookout 12: misc.
 - Wild animal related accidents = 12
 - Domestic animal related accidents = 10
 - Allysia Angus asked whether accidents related to domestic animals have decreased since fencing was placed. Mr. Kunzler said he would look into it further. Ms. Angus also noted that the accidents listed are only the accidents that have been reported. There have been many more unreported accidents.
 - Mr. Kunzler then went on to give an overview of design criteria. He stated that there are certain guidelines provided that help engineers make good decisions and develop roads in a well-thought out manner. Tests have been performed on the criteria to help ensure the accuracy and that geometry is taken into consideration.

- Design criteria for SR-12 have not yet been set. The guidelines will help everyone understand what should be taken into consideration.
 - Shoulder widths are one of the areas of concern on SR-12. Standard shoulder widths are 2 ft. to 8 ft. Shoulder widths on SR-12 tend to be between 0 ft. and 3 ft. As a rule, shoulders do not have to be paved. They just have to be a stable surface that a vehicle can safely traverse.

9. *Group Exercise: Understanding of and Input on SR-12 Design-Criteria Exercise*

- Following the design criteria overview, the committee members were given templates with appropriate design speeds designated on them. The committee members were asked to view the six segment maps of the SR-12 corridor between Escalante and Boulder that had been laid out on the tables and determine solutions for those segments. They were each given a handout to write their solutions on. In the interest of time, each committee member was asked to start with the segment that they are most passionate about and then move from there. Comments have been captured on the maps.
 - Following the exercise Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked each committee member to identify one solution from their list and share it with the committee. They are as follows:
 - Put a parking lot on the north end of the Hogsback and allow one lane of traffic during high tourist season. Utilize the other lane for bicycle and pedestrian access. Allysia Angus noted that this would be fairly easy and cost-effective to test.
 - Put in a walking path along the Hogsback in addition to the two lanes of traffic.
 - Put in a cantilever path along the Hogsback for bicycle use. Also use flashers letting motorists know there is a bicyclist on the road.
 - Place a Utah Highway Patrol car on the corridor with a mannequin in it. Some of the committee members made the comment that they didn't feel this approach would add to the experience.
 - There is a safety issue coming up out of the Calf Creek area. Eliminating the pullout on the east side of the road would help. Change the way people use the pullout. Address access safety at all of the pullouts and points of attraction.
 - Put in a deceleration lane approaching Hole-in-the-Rock road.
 - Add warning signs for drastic speed changes (i.e. 35 mph 800 feet ahead). Try putting the signs in the pavement itself with color variations instead of off to the side of the road where it can obstruct views.
 - Just after Head-of-the-Rocks, straighten the sharp curve but leave existing curve/road as a pullout.
 - Put in an interpretive site/pullout for the trail up to Bolington Road near Head-of-the-Rocks.
 - Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne wrapped up the exercise and stated that it would be revisited at the next meeting to allow the committee members to finish identifying solutions.

10. *Context Sensitive Committee Business*

- *Status of CSC Goals*
 - The following items have been covered so far:
 - Context
 - Needs
 - Evaluation Criteria

- Preliminary Alternatives
- The evaluation criteria chart will be updated with comments from the day's meeting.
- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked the committee members what they would like to hear more about at the next committee meeting. The answers that were provided are as follows:
 - Allysia Angus: workable copies of the maps would be great. The project team will provide copies of the maps in 11x17 format for the next meeting. Power lines and GIS data with WSA information will be added to the maps.
 - Jim Catlin would like law enforcement issues and speed data covered. John Mavor stated that there are less intrusive ways to mitigate speed than more policemen. Allysia Angus said it would be helpful to have a half an hour interaction with law enforcement and EMS.
 - Jim Catlin suggested that the committee members bicycle the corridor to gain a better understanding of the road from that point of view. It was determined that a field review would be conducted prior to the next meeting.
- *Next Meeting*
 - May 31st: field review beginning at 1:00 p.m.
 - Hike, bike, and drive the corridor
 - Meet at the Moqui Motel in Escalante
 - June 1st: CSC meeting #3 in Escalante
 - Logistical information will be forthcoming

Parking Lot Items:

- Guidelines for maintenance activities
- Change in frequency of wildlife related crashes after BLM installed fencing
- Perceived vs. actual safety for bicyclists

THANK YOU!

The previous summary is the writer's interpretation of the meeting discussion. If there are any discrepancies or items that need clarification or correction, please notify Kim Clark or Michelle Fishburne of H.W. Lochner.